

United States Patent and Trademark Office

N

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	į F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/668,661	09/23/2003		Jean-Claude Yvin	16721-0250 (42528-292745)	1057
881	7590	02/16/2006		EXAMINER	
STITES &		SON PLLC AX STREET	HENRY, MICHAEL C		
SUITE 900				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDI	RIA, VA	22314	1623		

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/668,661	YVIN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael C. Henry	1623
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vortice to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATE 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. timely filed momentum the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		•
1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a)☐ This action is FINAL. 2b)☑ This 3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters,	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. ion is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applic rity documents have been rece u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No sived in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) ☐ Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Mai 5) ☐ Notice of Inform	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/24/05</u> .	6) Other:	,

Application/Control Number: 10/668,661

Art Unit: 1623

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-10 are pending in application

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed complies with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 2 recite the phrase "comprising administration". However, the phrase renders the claims indefinite, since it is unclear to whom or what the compound is being administered. More specifically, it is unclear who the recipient is intended to be. Furthermore, claims 1 and 2 are indefinite for failing to particularly point out what disease(s) or condition(s) is being treated by the administration of said agents or compounds or for what purpose are the agents administered. Consequently, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claims 3 and 4 recite the phrases "naturally derived compounds and "miscellaneous drugs". However, these phrases render the claims indefinite, since it is unclear which compounds are considered naturally derived compounds and how or from what the said

Art Unit: 1623

compounds must be derived in order to be considered a naturally derived compound. Also, it is unclear what drugs or compounds are considered miscellaneous drugs.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Di Luzio et al. (Progress in Cancer Research and Therapy (1978), 7 (Immune Modulation Control Neoplasia Adjuvant Ther.), 171-82).

In claim 1, applicant claims "Chemotherapeutic antineoplastic method comprising administration of an effective amount of an antineoplastic agent in conjunction with an effective amount of a β-1,3 glucan. Di Luzio et al. disclose applicant's method comprising the administration of an effective amount of an antineoplastic agent (cyclophosphamide) in conjunction (combination) with an effective amount of a β-1,3 glucan (CAS # 9012-72-0) to rats (see abstract). Claim 3 is drawn to a method according to claim 1 wherein the antineoplastic agent is selected from specific compound including alkylating agents. Di Luzio et al. disclose applicant's method wherein the antineoplastic agent is alkylating agent, cyclophosphamide (see abstract). Claim 5 is drawn to a method according to claim 1 wherein the antineoplastic agent is cyclophosphamide. Di Luzio et al. disclose applicant's method wherein the antineoplastic agent is cyclophosphamide (see abstract). Claim 7 is drawn to a chemotherapeutic antineoplastic method according to claim 1 wherein the β-1,3 glucan is administered orally, intravenously or

Application/Control Number: 10/668,661

Art Unit: 1623

intraperitoneally. Di Luzio et al. disclose applicant's method wherein the β -1,3 glucan is administered intravenously (see abstract). Claim 9 is drawn to a chemotherapeutic antineoplastic method according to claim 1 wherein the β -1,3 glucan is administered before, simultaneously to or after the antineoplastic agent. Di Luzio et al. disclose applicant's method wherein the β -1,3 glucan is administered simultaneously to (in combination with) the antineoplastic agent (see abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Di Luzio et al. in view of Yvin et al. (US 2003/0119780 A1).

In claim 2, applicants claim a "Chemotherapeutic antineoplastic method comprising administration of an effective amount of an antineoplastic agent in conjunction with an effective amount of laminarin. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 are drawn said method according to claim 2 involving the use of specific antineoplastic agents, the use of the antineoplastic agent, cyclophosphamide, and specific routes and ways of administration of the laminarin and the antineoplastic agent.

Di Luzio et al. disclose a method comprising the administration of an effective amount of an the antineoplastic agent, cyclophosphamide for the treatment tumors in rats (see abstract).

Furthermore, Di Luzio et al. disclose a method comprising the administration of an effective

Application/Control Number: 10/668,661

Art Unit: 1623

amount of an antineoplastic agent (cyclophosphamide) in conjunction (combination) with an effective amount of a β -1,3 glucan (CAS # 9012-72-0) to rats (see abstract)

The difference between applicant's claimed method and Di Luzio et al.'s method is that Di Luzio et al. do not use the glucan, laminarin.

Yvin et al. disclose a method treating cancer growth (tumor growth) comprising the administration of an effective amount of soluble laminarin to mice (see page 4, sections [0094] to [0099]).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed invention was made, in view of Di Luzio et al and Yvin et al., to have used the method of Di Luzio et al. to prepare a composition comprising a combination of a antineoplastic agent such as cyclophosphamide and a glucan such as laminarin to treat tumors, since the combination of compounds that are used to treat the same diseases or conditions are well known in the art. More specifically, it is obvious to combine individual compositions taught to have the same utility to form a new composition for the very same purpose. In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 205 U.S.P.Q. 1069 (C.C.P.A. 1980).

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated in view of Di Luzio et al and Yvin et al., to have used the method of Di Luzio et al. to prepare a composition comprising a combination of a antineoplastic agent such as cyclophosphamide and a glucan such as laminarin to treat tumors, because a skilled artisan would reasonably be expected to prepare a composition comprising a combination of the compounds taught by Di Luzio et al and Yvin et al., to treat tumors based on type, stage and/or severity of the tumors.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1623

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Henry whose telephone number is 571-272-0652. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm; Mon-Fri. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia Anna Jiang, Ph.D can be reached on 571-272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-1235.

Michael C. Henry

Shaojia Anna Jiang, Ph.D. Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1623

February 8, 2006.